

REMARKS

In this response to the above-identified Office Action, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks. Claims 15 and 16 have been previously withdrawn from consideration. Claims 17 to 23 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 2, and 7 have been amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. Accordingly, Claims 1-14 are pending in the application.

Claim Amendments

Applicant has amended Claims 1, 2 and 7 to include “an image transfer memory”, “receiving image into the image transfer memory”, and “wherein said image sensor, said display, said image sensor orientation sensor, said display orientation sensor, said image transfer memory and said image manipulator are co-located within a single enclosure” (emphasis added). Support for the amendments may be found in the specification at least in Page 8 ln. 13-17, Page 8 ln. 25-31, Page 10 ln. 30-31, and Page 11 ln 1-8. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added.

Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

To anticipate a claim, a single reference must disclose each element of that claim.

Claims 1-3, 6, 17, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Edwards (US 7,312,766).

Claim 1 and 2 have been amended to incorporate “an image transfer memory”, “receiving image into the image transfer memory”, and “wherein said image sensor, said display, said image sensor orientation sensor, said display orientation sensor, said image transfer memory and said image manipulator are co-located within a single enclosure”, or similar limitations (emphasis added). Examiner has not relied upon and Applicant has not been able to discern any part of Edward (US 7,312,766, hereafter “Edwards”) that teaches the above limitations.

Edwards discloses a separate head-mount display and a remote camera wherein the displayed image is time and motion compensated for camera movement. Edwards doesn't teach the image transfer memory, nor the sharing of the image manipulator, not the integrating the image sensor, the display, the position sensor, and the image manipulator into a single device.

Applicant believes that Claims 1 and 2 as amended are patentable over Edwards. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of these claims are requested.

Claims 3 and 6 are dependent from independent Claim 1. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to the independent claim, Applicant believes that Claims 3 and 6 are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of these claims are requested.

Claims 17 and 19-20 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the Examiner must show that the cited references, combined, teach or suggest each of the elements of a claim. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Further, the combination of elements must be more than the predictable use of prior art elements according to their established functions. See *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. ___, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007).

Claims 4, 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Edwards. Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

Claim 4 is dependent from independent Claim 1. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to the independent claim, Applicant believes that Claim 4 is patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of this claim are requested.

Claim 7 has been amended to incorporate “an image transfer memory”, “receiving image into the image transfer memory”, and “wherein said charge coupled device image sensor, said orientation sensor, said display device, and said image manipulator are co-located within a single enclosure” (emphasis added). Examiner has not relied upon and Applicant has not been able to discern any part of Edwards that teaches the above limitations.

Edwards discloses a separate head-mount display and a remote camera wherein the displayed image is time and motion compensated for camera movement. Edwards doesn't teach the image transfer memory, nor the sharing of the image manipulator, not the integrating the image sensor, the display, the position sensor, and the image manipulator into a single device.

Applicant believes that Claim 7 as amended is patentable over Edwards. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of these claims are requested.

Claim 8 is dependent from independent Claim 7. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to the independent claim, Applicant believes that Claim 8 is patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of this claim are requested.

Claim 5, 9, 13(1), 13(2) and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Edwards in view of Thomas (US 6,781,623).

Claim 5 is dependent from independent Claim 1. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to the independent claim, and because Edwards in view of Thomas (US 6,781,623, hereafter “Thomas”) does not teach or suggest each of the elements of these claims, Applicant believes that Claim 5 is patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of this claim are requested.

Claim 9 is dependent from independent Claim 7. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to the independent claim, and because Edwards in view of

Thomas does not teach or suggest each of the elements of these claims Applicant believes that Claim 9 is patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of this claim are requested.

Claim 13 is dependent from independent Claim 1 or Claim 2. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to the independent claims, and because Edwards in view of Thomas does not teach or suggest each of the elements of these claims Applicant believes that Claim 13 is patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of this claim are requested.

Claim 14 is dependent from independent Claim 7. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to the independent claim, and because Edwards in view of Thomas does not teach or suggest each of the elements of these claims Applicant believes that Claim 14 is patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of this claim are requested.

Claims 11 (1), 11 (2), 12 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Edwards as applied to claims 1, 2, 7 and 17 above, and further in view of Ahisha(US 2005/0007477) and Riconda et al.(US 2002/013093).

Claim 11 is dependent from independent Claim 1 or Claim 2. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to the independent claims, and because Edwards in view of Ahisha (US 2005/0007477, hereafter “Ashiha”) and Riconda et al.(US 2002/013093, hereafter “Riconda”) does not teach or suggest each of the elements of these claims, Applicant believes that Claim 11 is patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of this claim are requested.

Claim 12 is dependent from independent Claim 7. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to the independent claim, and because Edwards in view of Ahisha and Riconda does not teach or suggest each of the elements of these claims Applicant believes that Claim 12 is patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of this claim are requested.

Claim 21 has been withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 10 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Edwards as applied to claims 7 and 17 above, and further in view of Harrison (US 6,597,384).

Claim 10 is dependent from independent Claim 7. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to the independent claim, and because Edwards in view of Harrison (US 6,597,384, hereafter “Harrison”) does not teach or suggest each of the elements of these claims, Applicant believes that Claim 10 is patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of this claim are requested.

Claim 18 has been withdrawn from consideration.

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Edwards in view of Hinckley et al. (US 7,289,102).

Claim 22 has been withdrawn from consideration.

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Edwards in view of Hinckley et al. and Thomas.

Claim 23 has been withdrawn from consideration.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application; the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees to process this Amendment, or credit any over-payments that may apply, to our Deposit Account No. 50-2421.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 13, 2009

/David R. Stevens/
David R. Stevens
Reg. No. 38,626

Stevens Law Group
1754 Technology Dr., Ste. 226
San Jose, CA 95110
Tel (408) 288-7588
Fax (408) 288-7542